

## MEMORANDUM

---

---

**To:** Stephanie Vaughn, EPS  
**From:** Marcia Greenblatt, Rob Law  
**Date:** August 23, 2013  
**Subject:** Revised SSP2 Locations

---

---

EPA, the Partner Agencies, and the CPG have been in discussions regarding selection of sampling locations for the SSP2 program during winter and spring, 2013. During a conference call on May 9, 2013, it was agreed that the CPG would perform a probing survey to identify locations for sediment samples, and to identify locations where the sediment bed was rocky or gravelly, where sediments could not be collected. EPA indicated that the goal was to identify "actionable volumes of sediment," suggesting that sampling was not necessary in areas where the sediment bed was predominantly coarse-grained or limited in depth. The CPG performed the probing survey June 3-6, 2013. Based on the results of this survey, the CPG proposed a revised set of locations for SSP2 samples. The proposed SSP2 locations are summarized in the attached table, and presented in the attached figures, with other available data (e.g., previous sample locations, utility conflicts, probing results).

The objective of identifying sample locations was to sample at all locations requested by EPA and the Partner Agencies, as recommended on May 21, 2013. Exact sample locations may have been adjusted based on utility conflicts and/or probing survey results. Below RM 11, the majority of the locations requested are included in the revised proposal. There were a limited number of locations where there was either a previously sample collected and the requested location (RM 8.75) or the probing indicated coarse sediments or less than 0.5' penetration depth (RM 8.42, RM 9.1-9.5). No new samples were proposed at these locations. Above RM 11, there were significant areas where the probing surveys indicated limited sediment (<0.5' penetration depth) and/or rocky/cobble/gravel substrate. The proposed SSP2 sampling locations above RM 11 is a subset of those requested by EPA and the partner agencies, as no samples were proposed where a contiguous sediment deposit was not evident, where utility conflicts are present, or where previous samples were collected.

The following are attached:

1. A summary table of locations, with an explanation of why each location was selected or not included

2. A figure showing the proposed SSP2 locations and probing results above RM 11
3. A figure showing proposed SSP2 locations, probing results, utility conflicts, and previous sample locations.
4. A figure showing proposed SSP2 locations and 2,3,7,8-TCDD concentrations from previous sampling programs